UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/681,820	10/08/2003	Tomoyuki Nakano	9319S-000558	6626	
	7590 03/21/2007 CKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.	EXAMINER			
P.O. BOX 828	·	NGUYEN, DUNG T			
BLOOMFIELL	D HILLS, MI 48303		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		,	2871		
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MO	NTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Α	pplication No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		1	10/681,820	NAKANO ET AL.				
		E	xaminer	Art Unit				
		0	ung Nguyen	2871				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communi r Reply	cation appea	rs on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ac	idress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any (ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MASSIONS OF THE MASSIO	AILING DATI of 37 CFR 1.136(a unication. tutory period will a will, by statute, cau	E OF THIS COMMUN). In no event, however, may pply and will expire SIX (6) Muse the application to become	NICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this of ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed	d on <i>08 Dece</i>	ember 2006.		,			
, <u> </u>	•		tion is non-final.					
3)	, 							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims		,					
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,4,7 and 12-14</u> is/are pend	ing in the ap	olication.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>13</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1,4,7,12,14</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or el	ection requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)□	The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.						
· <u>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </u>	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:		ed or b)□ objected t	o by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any object	tion to the dra	wing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including	the correction	is required if the drawir	ng(s) is objected to. See 37 C	FR 1.121(d).			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119				•			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)ر	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
			·					
A AA = 4:	va.							
Attachmen 1) Notic	• •		л. — ,_,, ,	. C				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
3) 🔲 Inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	·	5) Notice o	f Informal Patent Application	,			

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' amendment dated 12/08/2006 has been received and entered. By the amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 12 and 14 are now pending in the application. Claim 13 stand withdrawn from consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 4, 7, 12 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narutaki et al., US Patent No. 6,215,538.

Regarding claims 1 and 14, Narutaki et al disclose an electrooptic device (LCD device) (figures 1A-1B, 15A-15B) and a manufacturing method of the same having a reflective layer (3), a color layer (11) overlapping the reflective layer (see figure 1B), wherein the color layer is exposed using a mask ((col. 6, ln 49) and the mask has a pattern having a two-dimensional shape with no corner (see figure 15A-B). Narutaki et al., however, do not disclose the mask having an asymmetrical pattern. It would have been an obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a mask with an asymmetrical pattern since the examiner takes Office Notice of the equivalence of a mask with a symmetrical pattern or a mask with an asymmetrical pattern for their use in the display art and the selection of any of these known

Art Unit: 2871

equivalents for the purposes of forming a non-color filter region over a color filter would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claims 4 and 7, Narutaki et al. disclose the claimed invention as described above except for the mask has a polygonal two dimensional pattern. It would have been an obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a polygonal shape pattern corresponding to the reflective layer since the examiner takes Office Notice of the equivalence of such mask pattern without corner or polygonal shape pattern for their use in the display art and the selection of any of these known equivalents for the purposes of color adjusting would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 12, Narutaki et al. disclose the claimed invention as described above except for a control means for controlling the device. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ a controller, since it is a common practice in the art for driving and controlling a display device.

Note: the method of for manufacturing the device is merely a list of forming each component and each component must be formed to make the device; therefore, the method of for manufacturing would be inherent to the device.

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 12/08/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- . Election/Restriction Requirement

Application/Control Number: 10/681,820

Art Unit: 2871

Regarding claim 13, Applicants appear to believe that the phrase "exposed using a mask" provides specific structural characteristics; therefore, it must be given patentable weight and claim 13 should be included in elected group I. The Examiner respectfully disagrees with Applicant's view point. It should be noted that the limitation of "exposed using a mask" recites one step of the processing in a device claim and the presence of process limitations on product claims, which product does not otherwise patentably distinguish over prior art, cannot impart patentability to the product. In re Stephens 145 USPQ 656 (CCPA 1965). In other words, it would be a serious burden on the Examiner for searching two different groups of device and method whereas a specific method is being claimed.

. Rejection under 35 USC 102/103

In response to Applicant's argument that Narutaki et al. reference does not include certain features of Applicant's invention, the limitation(s) on which the Applicant relies (i.e., color filter having an asymmetrical opening or asymmetrical non-color filter region) is/are not stated in the claims. It is the claims that define the claimed invention, and it is the claims, not specifications flat arc anticipated or unpatentable. Constant v. Advanced MicroDevices Inc., 7 USPQ 2d 1064. In addition, as stated above, the use of the mask having asymmetrical pattern and the mask having symmetrical pattern would have been obvious to one skilled in the art.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2297. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Nelms can be reached on 571-272-1787. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

DN 03/19/2007

Dung Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 2871